

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion

Volume III, No. 23

January 10, 1944

\$1.50 per year; 10 cents per copy

1944—The Premises of Peace

THE perspective of weeks is stimulating second thoughts on the Moscow, Cairo and Teheran declarations. Among leaders of the churches, initial exultation that the statesmen should have met, agreed and spoken unitedly is widely giving way to misgiving over the presuppositions which appear to have underlain their meetings, the content of their agreements and the direction of their united pronouncements. It should be emphasized that this misgiving is not confined to those churchmen who approach the tortuous problems of peace with the same Utopian illusions which prevented them from facing the realities of war. It is prevalent among those Christians who recognized the true significance of the conflict from the outset, urged America's responsibilities in it and have insisted that the most promising peace which can be expected will be one in which force and immediate self-interest will be moderated, but not cancelled, by justice and the larger interest of all.

Apprehension is due mainly to deepening questioning as to whether those whose major concern and responsibility is victory in war can be expected to fashion a sound and secure peace. It is not primarily that the Big Three lack the requisite ability; probably no abler triumvirate could be assembled from the dominant powers. It is certainly not that they lack information; no others are so well equipped. It is not that they are wanting in the desire or will to peace. It is rather that those whose days and nights are preoccupied with immediate military problems seem unable to achieve the detachment and perspective essential for peace-making.

It has become almost axiomatic that, this time, the peace will grow organically from the war. In a sense, that is both necessary and right. But it is precisely the too literal and uncritical assumption of that axiom which underlies the fatal inadequacies of present plans. They rest upon the supposition that the world in which peace must be preserved will, in basic essentials, be the world in which the war is being fought. Take three illustrations. It is assumed that Germany and Japan, in the future as now, will constitute the major threats to the peace of the world. It is assumed that the four powers, now forced by the exigencies of survival into alliance, will continue,

in peace, in intimate and harmonious collaboration. It is assumed that the only effective recourse for the prosecution of war—massed military might—is likewise the alone effective instrument for the policing of peace.

It may be doubted whether any of these three premises can claim the sanction of sound historical judgment. As for the first, Germany and Japan will certainly be stripped of all capacity for early war-making. And it is well to bear the very different alignments of the last war and of earlier conflicts constantly in mind. As for the second, modern history lends little encouragement to the hope that an alliance born of the necessities of common peril will furnish a stable foundation for peace. A salutary starting-point for statesmen might be a graph on which were charted the changing arrangements of alliances and enmities over the last century. As for the third, when has military might in the hands of great and rival powers proven a guarantor of security and peace?

What alternative premises might well guide the architects of the peace? Let us suggest three.

1. The dominant mood of the post-war era controlling the actions of peoples and nations will be—*reaction*. Not continuation of but revulsion from the arrangements necessitated by war will dominate men's desires. Surely this is a clear lesson from the aftermath of the last war. Is there good reason to expect that it will not be repeated? War commands titanic centripetal compulsions. Peace will loose tethered centrifugal impulses. War magnifies affinities and disguises antipathies within nations and between allies. Peace will release latent rivalries and antagonisms. War glorifies the mass and conscripts all in its service. Peace will restore the inveterate human concern for the particular and individual, both persons and nations.

2. One expression of post-war reaction, also illustrated in the last peace, may well be radical *reorientations in national leadership and policies*. Britain will almost certainly witness a drift to the left, the United States not improbably to the right. The future in Russia and China are more unpredictable. Were decision to remain in the hands of the

four men who, through continuous communication and now face-to-face conference, have hewn out difficult understandings and mutual confidence, their formula of continuing collaboration might have a fighting chance of fulfillment. But, suppose them replaced by those who have not known intimate comradeship in common cause and suppose the latter to be under the normal suasions of national, party and special interest, now leashed but again free, and the prospect alters.

3. Modern war springs never solely from vicious megalomania, however deeply rooted within a national psychology, but from false ideology exacerbated by frustration and empowered by just grievance. Therefore, *security for peace lies*, not in perpetuation of the abnormal expedients of war, but *through planned evolution toward an order whose inherent justice will make aggression not only unprofitable but unnecessary.*

H. P. V. D.

The German Problem

REINHOLD NIEBUHR

OF the many tragic aspects of our age, none is greater than the failure of Germany. It is the failure of a great people, fallen to as low a state of moral and political corruption as we are likely to see for many centuries. Such insanity as the Germans developed would not, of course, have been possible if the rest of the world had not provided a static corruption as the soil out of which the dynamic evil of the German mania developed. Nevertheless the failure of Germany is truly tragic. It must be understood if it is not to arouse the victors to vindictive passions which will destroy every possibility of a creative peace. For hatred is always blind and confuses the counsels of individuals and nations.

We cannot understand Germany by counting Nazi and anti-Nazi noses and by debating the question whether there are more Nazis than anti-Nazis in Germany. We are fools if we think that all Germans are Nazis; and only a little less foolish if we imagine that the German tragedy can be explained merely as a Nazi conspiracy against a good Germany. The parent of a wayward son is not necessarily wayward; but that does not absolve the "good" parent of responsibility for the waywardness of the son. There is a "good" Germany; but this "other" Germany participates in the failure of the nation. Perhaps the first contribution which a profound Christian faith could make to an analysis of the German problem would be to deliver our culture from the vulgar "Pelagianism" which thinks of good and evil only in terms of an explicit obedience to, or defiance of, a moral code. The "good" Germany was tragically inept in politics and contributed to the rise of Hitlerism by this ineptness. No conscious perversity, such as the Nazis exhibited, characterized the good Germany. And there is no form of calculated punishment which will either cure Germany of its profoundest errors or serve as a deterrent for others.

The Germans have been politically inept for many

reasons. In terms of social history they were inept because the middle class revolution which laid the foundation for democracy in the Anglo-Saxon world never achieved sufficient self-respect in Germany to break the power of the old aristocratic military tradition. It was not even able to do so when the collapse after the first world war produced a coalition of bourgeois and proletarian forces behind democracy. The older aristocratic tradition remained in power behind the scenes. Even today the Junkers may be more dangerous for the future peace of the world than the more corrupt and more fragile Nazi culture.

If we seek to explain this lack of spiritual power of the rising middle classes, and finally even of the working classes, we touch upon a whole maze of cultural and religious factors. The Germans have always had a too uncritical devotion to the state. Perhaps they learned this from Luther, who made the mistake of being more afraid of anarchy than of tyranny. The Germans were always better realists than the Anglo-Saxons. But their political realism was tainted with cynicism; and that was a more grievous error than the sentimentality which colored Anglo-Saxon idealism. The stuff of political history is always morally ambiguous; but it may be better to be blind to the "power" factors in politics if that is the only way men can be relatively devoted to standards of justice, than to fall into the cynicism of making power self-justifying.

The Germans are philosophically minded. In both their religious and philosophical history they have illumined some of the ultimate issues of life more profoundly than any other people since the Greeks. But, like the Greeks, they have been deficient in dealing with the proximate issues of life, particularly with the all important issue of organizing the human community. Perhaps eminence in the one field contributed to failure in the other, not

only because the best minds were drawn away from the problems of the community but more particularly because a tolerable political harmony in any community requires compromises and adjustments which the "systems" of abstract thinkers do not allow. Long before Hitler made politics demonically religious all political life in Germany was too religious. There was a separate "Weltanschauung" behind every political party.

To these unique German causes of failure we must in all fairness add some other causes which modern Germany shared with the modern world. German liberalism in its naïve form was even more naïve than Anglo-Saxon liberalism. When Hindenburg and von Papen conspired to destroy the Weimar republic the German labor-liberals futilely appealed to the supreme court and forgot that the supreme court, particularly in a chaotic world, follows the election returns, or the power-political analogy of election returns. German liberalism in its sophisticated form was even more sophisticated than Western liberalism. It had lost all faith in standards and values of any kind. It created the religio-cultural vacuum, into which the seven devils of Hitlerism entered.

German Marxism in its social-democratic variety distilled the illusion of fatalistic inaction from Marxist determinism. German Marxism in its communist variety separated Marxist cynicism from its realism; and made the cause of revolution an end in itself, even to the point where it was willing to cooperate with Nazis to bring it about. Furthermore the two forms of Marxism divided the working class between them; and both helped to divide the industrial poor from the agrarian poor. These aberrations Germany shared with us. Only we were not far enough advanced in our social thought to be deeply harmed by them. It may be well to remember that it is still possible for us to make some of these mistakes fifty years hence.

One could go on indefinitely measuring the various strands of error and futility which contributed to the rise of Hitlerism. Perhaps we have gone far enough to justify the suggestion that any imaginative approach to the failure of the German people must result in the conviction that the failure is too profound and elusive to be amenable to some simple form of calculated punishment, however exacting. We can save neither the German people nor ourselves by some nicely measured punitive justice. This tragedy can be comprehended in prayer and in tears; but it is not understood by either the soft or the hard sentimentalists.

The real problem about Germany is not how we can punish her but how we can finally relate her creatively to a community of nations. Perhaps the most serious part of this problem arises from the fact

that she has automatically excluded herself from leadership in the organization of the European continent, thus forcing essentially non-continental world powers to organize the continent, a difficult and desperate undertaking in which they may not succeed.

The final health of Germany depends upon the creation of a healthy continent; just as a healthy continent also requires an ultimately healthy and sane Germany; and as a tolerably healthy world community requires a decently reorganized European continent. Our future destinies are thus mutually intermingled. The peril of vindictiveness lies primarily in the fact that it beguiles us from pursuing our mutual destiny. Any theory which assumes that we can solve the world's problem merely by fathoming the depth of evil in the German soul and seeking to suppress it betrays us into the evils into which self-righteousness is always betrayed. It does not understand that the evil against which we contend is only a different, and probably a more extravagant, form of the evil which is in our soul also.

Just as self-righteousness is the root of vindictiveness, so is contrition and the recognition of mutual guilt its cure. It is a question whether the recognition of the mutuality of guilt is possible in any other than profoundly religious terms. This is why the preaching of the gospel is so relevant to the reconciliation of nations. All conflict, and not only military conflict, makes for self-righteousness. We are better than the foe against whom we contend. There are at least many cases in which this is the case. But we are nevertheless profoundly involved in the sin of the foe. Sometimes we are guilty of milder forms of the evils which we oppose in the foe. One thinks of the pride of races and nations in the so-called democratic world as a potent source of international friction, long after the Nazis are destroyed. Sometimes we are guilty of opposite errors. One thinks of the international anarchy of the democratic world which gave the tyranny of Nazism its chance.

Yesterday we had to stand against the sentimentalists who declared that we had no right to resist Nazi tyranny because we were also guilty. They did not know that common guilt is a perennial fact in history, which does not annul our responsibility to strive for relative justice. Today we must resist the Pharisees who imagine that our impending victory is the proof and the validation of our virtue. Yesterday the sentimentalists falsely regarded the humility which men ought to have in God's sight as a reason for being humble in the sight of the Nazis. Today the self-righteous Philistines will seek falsely to play the part of God and try to summon the defeated foe to a judgment in which they are themselves involved.

The recognition of the mutuality of guilt does not of course preclude the necessity and advisability of relative punishment for the relatively guilty. Here

it will be important to make a sharp distinction between the profound guilt of the German people which is too deep to be reached by our punishment and the particular guilt of particular Nazi tyrants. It goes without saying that specific acts of tyranny and cruelty ought to be punished. It may be shocking to suggest that some of this punishment may well take place in exactly in the hour of the Nazi collapse. The idea of international courts to try these criminals for the sake of establishing the sanctity of international law is largely illusory. An international court organized by victors may have the form, but will not have the substance, of such sanctity. It may make martyrs out of criminals. At any rate it may be better to have Germans destroy their criminals in hot blood than have the victors do it in cold blood. Either way has its hazards; and both ways will undoubtedly be tried. There is no reason for a zealous preference for one over the other.

It may be shocking to observe, but it is nevertheless true, that one reason for the severe punishment of these individual criminals is that it may act as a *catharsis* and draw off some of the vindictiveness which Nazi cruelties have generated. Thus there would be less likelihood that vengeance will bedevil the peace.

As for the punishment of the German people as such, it must be taken for granted that they must make restitution to the despoiled peoples insofar as this is possible. This applies particularly of course to the wealth which the Nazis have syphoned out of the whole of Europe. No restitution will return its dead to life. But the possibilities here are limited. The last war proved the futility of long reparation payments in terms of both economics and morals. Christian piety might well add counsel to the wisdom of the nations on this point and remind them of the word of Scripture: "Vengeance is mine, I will repay, saith the Lord." Which means that the processes of history under the providence of God visit such terrible punishment upon the evil-doer, that our power to add or subtract from it seems puny indeed, and our effort to do so pretentious. The majesty of the German cities will have been reduced to rubble. The defeated nation will be politically, economically, morally and spiritually bankrupt. It will face chaos and humiliation in every direction. The war has punished the victors also. But no one would quarrel at the justice of that fact; since they are also guilty of the evils which we are seeking to overcome. If there is a difference in the proportion of guilt, as indeed there is, would anyone question that this is not sufficiently measured by the difference between victory and defeat?

No matter how we turn this problem or from what angle we approach it, it becomes apparent that the punishment of a guilty and defeated nation is a very

subordinate problem in reconstituting our world. If we become obsessed with it, it will prevent us from accomplishing our real task.

Our real problem is to build a world community strong enough to discourage the kind of aggression which the Nazis attempted. Our real problem is to strengthen the bonds of mutual responsibility between the nations in such a way that a future aggressor will not be able to pit one peace-loving nation against another, or persuade them to await the acts of the despoiler, each in turn, while all look on in shivering and cowardly impotence. Our real task is to find political implements for the budding sense of mutual responsibility which now exists. Our task is to find a working accord between the hegemonous powers. If this is not done, one of them may well draw Germany into its orbit, make it a partner in some future war and justify some future Vansittart in the thesis that Germany is congenitally corrupt.

Our problem is to extend the partnership between the hegemonous powers in such a way it will lead to the reorganization of the European and Asiatic continent. If for instance Europe is partitioned into spheres of influence between the great powers (a still possible and terrible method of briefly mitigating the conflict of interests between them), we will have another war, no matter what we do about Germany. In that case we may well find France in the position of championing the cause of the continent against the hegemonous powers and we might find a De-Gaulle in the role of a slightly more decorous Hitler. Incidentally, the obsession of the tragic guilt of Germany has made us blind to the pathetic decay of France and oblivious to the fact that French tuberculosis may be as difficult to cure as German cancer.

In any event the primary task of the victorious nations is with themselves. They have the responsibility of organizing the world community. They have the power to do so. The future depends upon their willingness to use power responsibly and justly. If they fail, the German insanity may continue and be aggravated. If they succeed Germany can be rehabilitated in the world community of nations.

It is important to remember that vengeance is an egoistic corruption of the sense of justice. It is concerned with what the enemy has done to us. Therefore it is inclined to forget the sin of the enemy against the community of mankind and against God and to obscure the like sin which we have committed. That is why it is important to remember that, whatever the validity of our relative judgments, the final judgment belongs to God, who sees into the secret of our hearts. "Therefore judge nothing before the time, until the Lord come who both will bring to light the hidden things of darkness and will make manifest the counsels of the heart; and then shall every man have his praise of God."

The Voice of the Arabs

JABIR SHIBLI

THE Palestine problem is the creation of political Zionism and British imperialism. The Balfour Declaration is the child of this unholy alliance. The promise of the Arabs of Palestine as a national home for the Jews is the betrayal of a people who had been promised independence and encouraged to revolt against the Turks and aid the Allies, and who had raised an army of seventy thousand Arabs which formed the right wing of the Allied forces that conquered Palestine and Syria. The Arabs have not accepted and never will accept the Balfour Declaration or the mandate status. Britain had no right to give away a property not her own, nor had the Zionists a better right to accept an illegitimate gift that could not be delivered.

Political and secular Zionism has been one of the forces of darkness in the world, destructive of Jewry and Araby alike. When Zionist leaders took it upon themselves to commit their movement to the conquest of Palestine by aid of the sword, and entered the arena of international intrigue by making a political alliance with Britain, they betrayed the Jewish people and sowed the seed of the most cruel persecution in Jewish history. This alliance with Britain led Hitler to ascribe the breakdown of Germany's morale and her consequent defeat in the first world war to the sympathy of German Zionists with Britain, which the declaration about Palestine was intended to win. Then Nazi leaders, who were preparing for a war of revenge against Britain, lost confidence in the loyalty of German Jews and adopted a policy which led ultimately to barbarous mass extermination. The blunder of Zionist leaders is largely responsible for the blood of the innocents.

Moreover, since political Zionism made the Jews of all the world virtual or potential citizens of a Jewish state to be established in Palestine by ousting another nation already in possession, the Jews in other countries have been accused of seeking two citizenships and cherishing two allegiances. The deplorable increase of anti-Semitism all over the world, including Britain and America, is a vague response of the world's feeling to the attitude of political Zionism. For the human spirit detests aggression whether practiced by Hitler in Europe, by Japan in China, or by Zionism in Palestine.

Political Zionism has not only stirred up old hatreds but has also made new enemies for the Jews. The Arabs have no race prejudice or inherent dislike for the Jews, and Arab history is remarkably free from any deliberate persecution of the Jewish people. When medieval Christendom persecuted the Jews, the Arabs gave them refuge and kind hospitality. Before World War I there was no safer place for the Jews than

in Arab countries. Zionism is transforming the Arabs from old friends into bitter enemies.

For twenty-five years political Zionism has been a force making for the exploitation of Palestine and the disintegration of the life of its Arab inhabitants. It has poured into tiny Palestine half a million Jews who entered the country not as refugees seeking a home but as conquerors. It has acquired, with the backing of British military force and a large share of the wealth of the world, the most fertile areas of Palestine and made them the inalienable property of the Jewish people. It has dislodged thousands of Arab families from lands which they had cultivated for generations and sucked them into the cities where they work long hours for bad wages and live in miserable huts built of flattened tin cans. It has organized a closed and exclusive community in which no Arab may be employed, but where only Jews will produce and only Jews will profit. It has misrepresented to a scandalous degree Arab life and character, calling the Arabs an "uncivilized race," "bedouins" and "red Indians." And it has created a perpetual menace not only to Palestine but also to Syria, Iraq and Transjordan and the whole Arab world.

In the face of this black record and these stubborn facts that cannot be honestly denied, it is an added insult to tell the Arabs that the Zionist enterprise is a benefit to them. Whatever progress may have been made by the Arabs of Palestine has been made not because of Zionism but in spite of Zionism. The Zionists have done absolutely nothing to create confidence in Zionist honor and intentions. To the Arab mind economic benefits, if any, are overshadowed by the moral and vital issues that cannot be compromised. The Arabs would rather be starving and free than be fed as hewers of wood for alien masters.

Conscious of their great background and inspired by a new national awakening, quick with the promise of a more brilliant future, the Arabs are immovably united in defense of their sacred heritage. It is a delusion and misrepresentation of reality to think that the Arab revolt is due to the intrigues of the *efendi* class, the personal ambitions of the Grand Mufti, or the agents of Germany and Italy. It is the revolt of a proud and highly gifted people whose land has been invaded by military force but whose affection for their country is so passionate that they would rather die fighting in its defense than go elsewhere and live. Justice and the future are on their side. Should the million Arabs of Palestine be overwhelmed by foreign powers, the coming Arab union, which will have a hundred million people before the end of the present century, will take up the cause and redeem the heart and center of the

Arab world from alien invaders. The worst blunder of Zionism is that it underrated the strength of the Arabs and their unconquerable spirit.

Although Britain has served Zionism against the rights and welfare of the Arabs, twenty-five years of the Zionist experiment and the uncompromising opposition of the Arabs to Jewish domination have made it clear that a national home based on territorial sovereignty cannot be accomplished without constant use of military force. It was this realism that forced Britain to decide against the establishment of a Jewish state and against any further Jewish immigration into Palestine without the consent of the Arabs. When the Zionists found that their extreme demands were reduced to a limited Zionism, they accused Britain of "bad faith" and turned to America for support. They would have America involved in the hatreds and disputes generated by Zionism. Their lobbyists have already organized the American Palestine Committee, most of whose three hundred members are toadying politicians. But neither America nor the United Nations have any more right to give Palestine to the Zionists than the Arabs have to give New York to the Jews or Massachusetts to the Irish.

More recently another group has been created; namely, the "Christian Council on Palestine." When men speak in the name of a "Christian" body, the world has a right to expect words of justice, love and reconciliation. Instead, spokesmen of the Christian Council seem to be calling for a Protestant crusade in behalf of Zionism (not to lift up the banner of the Cross on the hill of Calvary, but to raise the star of David over the Church of the Holy Sepulchre and the Dome of the Rock). Perhaps these Christian gentlemen are not aware that there are 120,000 Christian Arabs in Palestine and two million Christian Arabs in the Near East who are wholeheartedly united with the Moslem Arabs in the defense of their country. The Christian Arabs are the children of the early Church, and they have a right to expect at least sympathy from the Christian brotherhood in America. Try to imagine how it would feel to a Christian Arab, or to a Moslem Arab, to learn that Christian clergymen and politicians are offering his country to others. How can our missionaries proclaim the gospel of love among the Arabs while the honorable members of the Christian Council conspire with the Jews to rob those same Arabs of their freedom and their native land? It is the height of impertinence, if not hypocrisy, to say that while Palestine is to be converted into a Jewish state, "the rights of the Arabs must be fully considered." To fight anti-Semitism is the duty of every civilized human being, but that duty could never be fulfilled by dispossessing or submerging the Arabs.

If "the Jewish problem is a Christian problem," honesty demands that Christians should solve it with what is their own, not with what belongs to the

Arabs. It would be more becoming if spokesmen of the Christian Council would use their eloquence to arouse the conscience of Christian nations to give the hapless Jews asylum in the vast domains of America, Canada, Brazil, South Africa, Australia and the boundless British Empire. Now that half a million Jews have found refuge in the tiny Arab state of Palestine, a state which has the same area and four times the population as Vermont, common decency, not to say Christian honor, would forbid any further stuffing of Jews into Palestine while the doors of vast continents are closed in their faces.

The encouragement of political Zionism is a disservice to the Jews and an injustice to the Arabs. For a Jewish state in Palestine would perpetuate enmity between two peoples who should be friends. Instead of providing a peaceful refuge for the infinitely persecuted people, it would be a volcano under the Jews within Palestine and a constant headache to those without. Such a state would make the Holy Land a breeding plot for wars.

The only rights that the Jews of the world have in Palestine are religious, not political. And it is only in a peaceful Palestine, based on Jewish-Arab friendship and cooperation, that the cultural and spiritual ideals of true Zionism can be fulfilled. If there is to be peace in Palestine, Zionism must abandon its political alliance with Western military power, and publicly renounce the intention to dominate or supplant the Arabs. There can be no other foundation than this for a lasting solution of the Palestine problem. Let the Jews spiritualize their conception of the National Home, and the world will yet see a new demonstration of Arab magnanimity and hospitality. As one united people with a common citizenship and equal rights, mingling together as good neighbors, Jews and Arabs will be fully able to constitute an independent democratic government capable of determining the future of Palestine and dealing with all subjects, including immigration. In mutual respect and true comradeship they could develop their common country and revive a civilization more brilliant than the one they built in the Middle Ages. In a world torn by greed and hate and force, the two branches of the Semitic race have an opportunity to give a fine example of good will and cooperation.

As for America, the Arabs have faith in her integrity. When Americans have the full truth of the Palestine reality, the American spirit of fair play will assert itself. America is fighting for the freedom of all peoples—everywhere. Surely the Arabs will not be made an exception. America is too gallant and true to take part in bullying into submission the brave Arabs who live in the land of the Saviour. Let American influence be used to heal the sore of Palestine and bring an understanding between Jews and Arabs. Let all who love Palestine pray for the peace of Jerusalem.

The World Church: News and Notes

International Organization Without Force

"Peace Action," the organ of the National Council for the Prevention of War, gives us a nice preview of the way the idealists will make common cause with the isolationists after the war. It declares that international organization after the war must "be volutary and on a democratic basis of full equality from the outset" and that "no military alliance, no imperialism, disguised perhaps as 'policing,' is compatible with sincere efforts for peace." Upon the basis of its dogma that force must not be applied to the organization of the world, it welcomes the fact that the declaration of the Fulbright resolution "favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to maintain a just and lasting peace" was weakened by the amendment demanding that the participation of the United States in such machinery shall be "through its constitutional processes." It rightly recognizes that this amendment means that our sovereignty is not to be abridged by any binding international agreements. For the same reason it hails the Republican platform of Mackinac Island as the ideal program for world peace because the platform asks for "post-war cooperative organization among sovereign nations" and declares that "peace and security ought ultimately to be established upon other sanctions than force."

Since it is inconceivable that international anarchy can be overcome without more binding agreements than those envisaged by the National Council, and since force will have to be an element in any international order, it is quite clear that we may count on the National Council for the Prevention of War to oppose any international policy which will really prevent war.

Archbishop of Canterbury on the German Church

In a united service of thanksgiving and intercessions, the Archbishop of Canterbury gave one of the addresses. In the course of his address the Archbishop said:

"It is most noteworthy that in all the occupied countries the chief and most persistent resistance to Nazi tyranny has come from the churches. This can occasion no surprise to those who have reflected on the true character of Christianity and National Socialism. Respect for the freedom of the human mind and spirit is at the very heart of the Christian gospel.

"So news comes from every quarter . . . telling of the courage of church leaders and the heroic constancy of the Church.

"From Germany also the same news comes. And here let me acknowledge that I was misled when some nine months ago, I said that the German Church had resisted only the curtailment of its own liberty and not the oppression of other people's. That impression was due to the fragmentary nature of the news which reaches us from Germany. But, in fact, church leaders in Germany have shown noble courage in upholding principles by which German conduct in Poland or Czechoslovakia or elsewhere is evidently condemned, and we honor them for their fearless witness."

The Christian and World Problems

The Department of International Friendship of the British Council of Churches has issued a new study pamphlet "The Christian and World Problems" in which the relationship of the Christian ethics to the political framework of the new world order is discussed. The study deals with problems of economic cooperation, security and armaments, minorities, the future of the Axis powers, Russia, and the Empire and colonies. In regard to the question of the portioning of Poland and the inclusion of the Baltic States, the pamphlet declares:

"It is understood that considerations of security are urged by the U. S. S. R. in connection with the Baltic States, and these no doubt deserve sympathetic consideration in view of the harsh facts of the years between the wars. But to treat this matter as one which may be settled simply by *force majeure* would be quite inconsistent with the principles for which the Allied Nations are fighting and with the principles of the Atlantic Charter. Christians will do no service to their cause or to the cause of international understanding by the evasion of realities.

"Christian conceptions of justice and right involve the creation of conditions of genuine religious liberty, and Christian voices must be firm in their support of fundamental principles. Religious liberty means more than bare freedom to worship. It means also freedom in preaching and teaching, and freedom for the Christian communities to live their life as communities, enjoying intercourse with their fellow-believers throughout the world, and to be part of that world community which is the Church Universal. If we hold that Nazism, with its denial of civil and religious liberty, is a matter not simply of domestic concern to Germans, but of religious liberty in Russia is a concern of Russia alone. And if strategic considerations should lead to the permanent incorporation of the Baltic States in Soviet Russia, their claim to enjoy the religious liberty which they formerly possessed would be very strong. It would be the clear duty of British Christians and of the British Churches to urge the British Government to make every possible representation to that effect to the Soviet Government. Religious liberty is one of the Four Freedoms, and those who are confident of the essential integrity of the U. S. S. R. should voice their conviction that it ought to grant religious liberty to all its citizens. Every branch of the Christian Church which believes in religious liberty ought to make its position clear and use every influence which it can command to promote full religious liberty throughout Russia and throughout the world.

Urge Post-War Conference to Consider United Church

The holding of a post-war conference to consider proposals for the establishment of a United Church in China was urged in Chengtu at an all-day retreat attended by some 60 Chinese church leaders and missionaries representing 13 different denominations and church organizations.

Christianity and Crisis

A Bi-Weekly Journal of Christian Opinion
601 West 120th St., New York 27, N. Y.

EDITORIAL BOARD

REINHOLD NIEBUHR, *Chairman*

JOHN C. BENNETT	RHODA E. MCCULLOCH
CHARLES C. BURLINGHAM	FRANCIS P. MILLER
F. ERNEST JOHNSON	EDWARD L. PARSONS
HENRY SMITH LEIPER	HOWARD C. ROBBINS
JOHN A. MACKAY	HENRY P. VAN DUSEN
DOROTHY CLEMENS, <i>Editorial Assistant</i>	

The Chengtu gathering climaxed a two-month series of group meetings called to consider various problems of post-war planning.

The conferees also gave warm approval to a suggestion that Negro missionaries be welcomed into China and endorsed proposals that "goodwill missions" be sent out from the Chinese Church to the churches of the West.

It was the consensus of delegates that there "should be a flow of missionaries from every nation and to every nation in order to build the sense of the Church as a world community in which every nation and race has its full and proper share."

In a discussion on the recruiting of Chinese Christian leadership it was pointed out that there were now 15,000 churches in China which would need 200 new theological students a year to meet their needs and that the present supply of new students was entirely inadequate for the future needs of the Church.

Findings of the conference, it was announced, will be published at a later date. RNS

Los Angeles Poll on Japanese Question

The *Los Angeles Times* has taken a poll on the sentiment of its readers on our attitude toward the Japanese. The results are very disturbing for they prove that on the West coast, at least, sentiment against the Japanese imperils any just solution of this problem. Some of the results are:

"Do you favor a constitutional amendment after the war for the deportation of all Japanese from this country, forbidding further immigration? Yes, 10,598; No, 732.

"Would you except American-born Japanese if such a plan as the above were adopted? Yes, 1,883; No, 9,018.

"Would you permanently exclude all Japanese from the Pacific Coast States, including California? Yes, 9,885; No, 999.

"Do you approve of the policy of freeing avowedly loyal Japanese to take jobs in the Midwest? Yes, 1,139; No, 9,750."

Public Library

Woodward & Kirby Aves.

Detroit 2, Mich.

650 1-45

Nisei Pastor Writes About Relocation

One of the Japanese American pastors of the Methodist Church, serving various congregations of the dispersed Japanese Americans, writes very assuringly about the process of relocation as follows:

"The program of dispersal resettlement has now passed the initial stage quite successfully. The concerted effort of the War Relocation Authority, the service committees, churches, and social agencies in providing hostel facilities, aiding in finding employment, housing, etc., have produced good results. Our main present task is that of adjustment, personal and social—of meeting the needs of companionship, social life, and of the feeling of 'belonging' and of 'being at home.' Basically, it is the psychological and religious problem of loneliness, of finding and reorienting oneself in the total scheme of things which looks bewildering and discouraging, to say the least. This is easier analyzed than solved. Depriving ourselves of the ordinary 'American' way of racially segregated church with fairly well established pattern of ministry, we are still in search for the best approaches of service. This program of integration and non-segregation is a new experiment in American urban community."

Communication

To the EDITOR:

I have read with much interest the article "Educational and Religious Barrenness" in the August 9th issue of *Christianity and Crisis*. Here, as in so much else we have to recognize that the American forces are the creation of "day before yesterday" as against the British Army that has been in the war business for decades and centuries as a constant feature of England's national life. Therefore, there is much that is lacking, as yet unprovided for and badly correlated.

However, more and more is being done with each passing month. For example here in the Middle East there is being set up a Correspondence School for the American Forces. Our institution is cooperating in the courses on the secondary school level, and Beirut University in those on a college level. This movement partly answers your criticisms. For a more comprehensive statement, I would refer you to the *Journal of Educational Sociology*, Vol. 16, No. 9, "Universities of the Armed Forces" by Major Berbon.

We have quite a group out here following with deep interest war and post-war developments.

CHARLES R. WATSON,
*American University at Cairo,
Cairo, Egypt.*

Author in This Issue

Jabir Shibli, a Christian native of Lebanon, Syria, is now professor of mathematics at the Pennsylvania State College. Mr. Shibli has studied at the American University of Beirut and holds degrees from Oberlin, the University of Wisconsin and Columbia University.

Having previously presented the Jewish side on the Palestinian question, we are now publishing Mr. Shibli's article in response to many requests that the Arab side of the issue be stated in our journal.